

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES OF WORK SESSION June 1, 1995

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgins, AlphaTRAC

Eugene DeMayo called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Reed Hodgins discussed the ground rules for the meeting. He also noted that some audience members may have an expectation that the agenda for tonight's meeting included specific worker issues; that is not the case. The audience was given a list of phone numbers for persons to contact at Kaiser-Hill, and a form was provided for them to write down any concerns, which would be forwarded to Kaiser-Hill for response.

BOARD/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Jim Burch, Jan Burda, Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Jack Kraushaar, Beverly Lyne, LeRoy Moore, David Navarro, Gary Thompson / Martin Hestmark, Steve Tarlton, Joe Wienand

BOARD/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Lorraine Anderson, Stuart Asay, Lloyd Casey, Chuck Clark, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Albert Lambert, Linda Murakami / Leanne Smith

PUBLIC/OBSERVERS PRESENT: Glenn Jameson, (ASG); Eric Engholm (EG&G); R. L. Newland (EG&G); Andy Herrera (EG&G); Larry Helmerick (DOE/CED); Joe F. Rippetoe (IMAA); R. R. Erle (EG&G); Chris Dayton (K-H); Sheldon Anderson (EG&G); Sasa Jovic (citizen); Elizabeth Baracani (Sverdrup Environmental); Thomas Clark (citizen); Bill Shultz (citizen); Laura Shultz (citizen); John Breitenbach (EG&G); Briand C. Wu (DOE); L. J. Marcech (EG&G); Dave Moody (LANL); S. K. Gupta (EG&G); R. T. Reiman (Technical Measurements); W. H. Diment (citizen); George Martelon (DOE-RFFO/SAIC); Joelle Klein (DOE/CRC/CED); Larry Stoddard (EG&G); Dave Ericson (EG&G); Beverly J. Smith (EG&G); Duane Catlett (LANL); Fred Porter (E2); Ann Sieben (Kaiser-Hill)

SOLAR POND UPDATE (Joe Wienand, DOE): DOE and EG&G have elected to defer some activities that were ongoing on the original proposal - to put the pondcrete, sludge and materials excavated from the solar ponds area under a 1,000-year cap. The deferment is based on potential changes made from the original design and assumptions. DOE is reviewing the possibility of putting waste material in a different location, and reviewing cost benefit analysis for new disposal options. Time frame is several weeks before DOE decides its direction.

ADMIN RECORD

Q/A to Briefing:

Question: You mentioned the pondcrete; what about the sludge?

Answer: We estimated a volume of material which included the sludge and pondcrete. We have taken out a portion of that; we need to review if including the pondcrete and sludge is still the right thing to do, or whether to look at them separately.

Question: How is the morale?

Answer: There is some stress with the project team, who worked very hard on the design that we had outlined.

DOE NATIONAL BUDGET UPDATE (Lance Schlag, DOE): In April, the site submitted the FY 97 field budget request. FY 97 officially starts in October of 1996. The first step is the Environmental Management Internal Review Board. The field office presented the field request on May 16, which was for approximately \$585 million. The Board reviewed and heard presentations; all the sites wanted more funding. The Board recognized that some requests were worthy and allocated an additional \$417 million across the complex. Rocky Flats got \$30 million of that total. However, the Board then had to determine how to come up with the \$417 million; Rocky Flats had to contribute \$32 million to fund the \$417 million. So the funding for Rocky Flats has essentially remained the same. A portion of the \$30 million contingency funds will be used to fund advanced deactivation activities. In FY 95, there was approximately \$816 million in the baseline; in the last month, Congress passed a rescission of \$200 million, of which the site contributed \$27 million. DOE-HQ did some realignment and Rocky Flats contributed \$15 million. With the new contract some workers will be laid off; there will be a net negative impact of about \$7 million. When the site submitted its EM request, it had a budget of \$639.5 million; however, at the EM program complex-level, that budget was \$300 million less than the sum of the field operations offices' requests. The department funded this shortfall by taking it out of FY 95 funds; another \$21.6 million will be removed from the budget in the next month or so.

Q/A to Briefing:

Question: Is the plutonium in that budget?

Answer: Yes.

Question: So this is everything?

Answer: No, this is not the total site budget. This covers the environmental management programs: nuclear material and facility stabilization, the waste management budget, and

the environmental restoration budget.

Question: What are the impacts of these cuts?

Answer: The \$21.6 million cut happened May 19. It has not yet been worked out. We're still analyzing the net impacts of work force restructuring. These are generally manageable and will not have an impact on scope; there were some underruns at the start of the year. The site is preparing a letter to stakeholders addressing the impacts. Most of the cuts have impacted the carryover/contingency funds available.

DOE COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS ON DISPOSAL CELL OPTIONS

PRESENTATION (Jeff Kerridge, DOE): Based on the Summit and QAT input, goals and objectives are to use resources wisely, and develop and obtain capacity for disposing LLW and LLMW by FY 98. QAT recommended that DOE prepare evaluation comparing on-site and off-site disposal. Options include: disposing of all waste off-site; remediation waste disposed/retrievable storage in several locations on-site; prepare a centralized CAMU for remediation waste; and develop a RCRA Subtitle C landfill/retrievable storage for LLMW and/or LLW. Some of the requirements used for designing and constructing a landfill include CDPHE regulations, Part 2 for siting hazardous waste disposal site (must have 1,000-year protection of waste from the public); Corrective Action Management Units (CAMUs); and RCRA Subtitle C Landfill (difference between CAMU and landfill - processed waste cannot go in a CAMU, and you do not need to treat to LDR to place in a CAMU - but do in a landfill). Preliminary cost evaluations compared to off-site disposal: CAMU (remediation waste, excluding pondcrete) - savings of \$240 million; RCRA Subtitle C (LLMW, remediation waste, and pondcrete) - savings of \$250 million; RCRA Subtitle C (LLMW and LLW, remediation waste, and pondcrete) - savings of \$285 million; CAMU & RCRA Subtitle C (remediation waste, pondcrete, LLMW and LLW) - savings of \$320 million. Off-site disposal (transportation, packaging and disposal) costs = \$380 million for 272,000 cubic yards of waste. Design and construction of an on-site facility would cost a minimum of \$60 million. DOE is looking to get stakeholder input, continue cost evaluations, identify points of risk (major roadblocks), and reach agreement soon about where to go from here.

Q/A to Briefing:

Question: Is this going to be permanent disposal on-site?

Answer: You can have retrievable storage, but that's very costly. One assumption was to map and grid so that we could retrieve certain portions if necessary.

Comment: It will be designed as a landfill, but in the event it became economical to do something else other than a landfill or we had a problem with it, it would also be designed to be retrievable. One issue is when do you fill a 1,000-year cap - when the cell is filled,

or wait to see if new technology becomes available.

Question: Is it possible that you might consider on-site retrievable monitored storage, rather than disposal?

Answer: Yes. It was considered in the past, but it's a very costly option. We can add that to our evaluation to show the relative cost savings to see if it's something we should pursue.

Comment: Within the protected area, the cost is significantly higher to manage the waste; there is real incentive to get it out of the protected area.

Comment: There are other things to be considered when counting the costs, besides mere dollars.

Question: Where will these disposal sites be - in the industrial zone, or somewhere else?

Answer: There are no locations that were excluded. One location we will consider is the OU4 proposed location as the centralized CAMU. We'll look at areas near the sanitary landfill, as well as the West Spray Fields.

Comment: There were asked to specifically look at the West Spray Fields area, as it had been contaminated before. QAT also would like to see the development of the landfill tied in to some mining of the gravel in the area.

Question: I believe there has been a lack of information presented about why OU4 has been delayed.

Answer: We are trying to look at these issues - to see if it is more economical to do something other than what we had planned.

Question: Does the state have a position or preference?

Answer: We sent a letter requesting that DOE look at the possibility of on-site disposal. With the CAMU concept for OU4, we are concerned that every cleanup area would become a CAMU and you would have many disposal sites across the site, and feel it is better to look at one or just a few sites.

Question: Disposal within Colorado may be necessary because of other states' restrictions, but why are you picking a place upstream from a metropolitan area and its water supply? Couldn't you save almost as much by doing the same thing on the downstream side?

Answer: There has been a suggestion that we look at areas like Last Chance landfill, or the Arsenal. However, we will have the cost of treatment to LDR standards. It wouldn't save as much money. Comment: DOE is kidding itself on cost savings. DOE needs to consider the cost of removing the waste and putting it in a landfill or elsewhere when it leaks - because it will someday, maybe even sooner than you think.

Comment: That's a cost that's faced by any landfill - so what are our options?

Comment: I realize we are dealing with serious budget constraints, but we will have to revisit this someday and hopefully we will have better options. There are some good reasons to keep it on-site, but Rocky Flats is in a lousy place and we have to deal with that. The idea that we are going to save money by burying waste on-site may be true, but there are other possibilities. I want to know how much it will cost if it's a problem in another 10 years.

Comment: There are an infinite number of possibilities to consider, and we could evaluate them forever.

Comment: Look at the possibility that it might have to be removed at some point, and decide if there's any reasonable chance of that and what would it cost. Also, the community is not in favor of permanent disposal at Rocky Flats, and that will be a serious obstacle.

Question: Why were we going for the OU4 disposal concept in the first place, if this other cell was available?

Answer: It was originally talked about but it didn't seem realistic at the time.

Comment: Also, we're starting to realize that we have three options on all the disposal sites: monitor them, try and treat them in place, or try to consolidate them. We had roadblocks on one of those options, so it became a problem from limiting our options on what we are able to do with them.

Question: What's the big objection to incineration?

Answer: There would be more contention on that option than for on-site disposal. We pursued it in the past. But you can't incinerate nuclear materials and make them turn into something else.

Question: What type of containers will be used in the landfill?

Answer: Drums and wooden crates.

Comment: I think you should consider the type of waste you plan to put in this cell. You might consider excluding very highly concentrated wastes, or liquid wastes, etc.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FOCUS GROUP (P2) PRESENTATION (DeAnne Butterfield, RFLII):

Eight priorities were developed at the March Summit - one was to improve public involvement. P2 has worked on helping to develop principles and guidelines. Some principles that were developed: 1) public participation needs to be connected to decisions; 2) recognize and accommodate different levels of participation and make opportunities for all; 3) decision makers need to communicate how input will be used to provide feedback; 4) discuss the purpose of public involvement - communicate at public meetings what is expected; and 5) don't let tradition constrain the desired system. Decisions on Rocky Flats issues need to flow from a fundamental consensus about what is important; the general public needs to share in "big picture" decisions. P2 has proposed that there be more attention to a deliberate and inclusive process in the major areas of interest such as plutonium disposition, waste disposition, building cleanup, and environmental restoration. P2 will prepare a draft document by the end of June. A question for CAB to consider is what role does CAB as an organization want to play in some of the "big picture" discussions.

SITE WIDE ISSUES COMMITTEE / RECOMMENDATION ON BUDGET REALLOCATION (Jan Burda):

The Site Wide Issues Committee has submitted a draft recommendation for CAB review. The recommendation will be forwarded to DOE stating supporting for DOE's proposal to shift funds from environmental restoration activities to other high risk activities at the site, contingent on DOE following conditions as stated by CDPHE, EPA and CAB.

Recommendation: Approve recommendation submitted by Site Wide Issues Committee - to DOE regarding the deferment of environmental restoration activities to reallocate funds for higher risk projects for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. A change was suggested under no. 4 / CAB conditions, to read as follows: "Include stakeholder involvement in decisions for deferment and reallocation of deferred funds."

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.

FUTURE SITE USE DISCUSSION (Alan Aluisi): The Alternative Use Planning Committee is seeking further input to help prepare its recommendation on future site use, to be brought before the Board in July. Two points were discussed in particular:

1) Draft wording for portion of recommendation: Although the Working Group recommends that the site be cleaned to background levels, the CAB should defer

endorsement of this section of the report until the Environmental/Waste Management Committee has addressed the question - "How clean is clean?"

Action: Motion to accept - unofficially - this wording to be included in the recommendation. APPROVED.

2) Draft wording for portion of recommendation: The Working Group did not reach consensus on three issues: 1) 80 acre commercial/office development in NE buffer zone; 2) transportation corridor across NW corner of buffer zone; and 3) non-cleanup related uses in the Industrial Area. Does the Board wish to:

a) Pursue consensus on these items and state that endorsement of the Working Group report reflects CAB consensus on these issues. Action: CAB members expressed differing opinions on each of the three issues. A vote to consider pursuing consensus on these issues in its recommendation did not pass.

b) Acknowledge that its members share the same range of opinion about these issues and state that the Working Group report is endorsed as is. It was suggested that the committee prepare alternate wording (conceptually, that CAB has a diverse range of opinions and cannot reach consensus on these issues, and adopts the Working Group report).

Action: Motion to accept - unofficially - the concept of this statement, to be rewritten prior to being included in the recommendation. APPROVED.

WORKER ISSUES (David Navarro): CAB agreed to add to the agenda a brief discussion of worker issues. David made a proposal as follows:

Recommendation: The CAB recommends to DOE that DOE sponsor a public meeting to solicit public input on the Rocky Flats FY 95 & 96 Work Force Restructuring Plan and the Rocky Flats Work Force Skills Assessment Study. It is imperative that EG&G, Kaiser-Hill, DOE-RFETS and DOE-HQ representatives be present at this meeting, so that issues pertaining to work force restructuring and contract reform may be addressed. This meeting must take place prior to EG&G closing the current VSPP application period.

Action: Consensus was not reached. There was a vote to move to super-majority (9 Board members in favor - more than 75% of those Board members in attendance). A subsequent vote to approve the recommendation failed (6 in favor, 5 opposed).

EXECUTIVE SESSION: RECOMMENDATION FOR NEW BOARD MEMBERS
(Jan Burda).

Recommendation: Approve the following individuals to serve as Board members: Tom Clark, Mike Freeman, Sasa Jovic, Michael Keating and Tom Marshall.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: July 6, 1995, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room

Agenda: Future Use recommendation; Retreat follow-up

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

- 1) Discuss CAB's public participation role at retreat - All CAB members
- 2) Forward to DOE recommendation on deferment of environmental restoration activities - staff,
- 3) Prepare future use recommendation, incorporating CAB input- Alternative Use Planning Committee

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:55 P.M.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

MINUTES APPROVED BY:

Secretary, Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Regarding storage of materials on-site, I have a concern with that mode. The British and Australians tried that, and it didn't work. Also, along the eastern boundary of the buffer zone there have been informal and formal measurements, and it is indeed contaminated.

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)